

INFANT  
BAPTISM

BAP  
S559



THE  
SCRIPTURE GUIDE  
TO  
INFANT BAPTISM.

BY  
REV. ISAAC SHOOK.



LOUISVILLE, KY.

PUBLISHED BY THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN  
BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

---

1851.

---

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1851,

By MILTON BIRD, *for the Proprietor,*

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States  
for the District of Kentucky.

---

---

Stereotyped by  
MORTON & GRISWOLD,  
*Louisville, Ky.*

THE  
SCRIPTURE GUIDE  
TO  
INFANT BAPTISM.

---

QUESTION 1. What is a Church?

ANSWER. All true believers, with their offspring.

Q. 2. As children are not capable of exercising faith in Christ, are they members of the Church?

A. They are: for the covenant was made with Abraham and his seed.

Q. 3. If children cannot exercise faith, what are the benefits of being in the Church?

A. They are members, in a state of minority. The Church is a place where they are trained up for God. They are in covenant relationship with God.

Q. 4. What is a Covenant?

A. An agreement between two or more parties.

Q. 5. Did God promise to make a covenant with Abraham?

A. He did. Gen. xvii. 2. "And I will make my covenant between me and thee."

Q. 6. What did God promise to do in this covenant ?

A. God promised, (1.) That of Abraham's seed the Messiah should come. Gen. xii. 2, 3. "And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: — And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

(2.) God promised to his posterity the land of Canaan for a possession. Gen. xv. 18. "In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates."

(3.) God promised to be a God unto Abraham and his seed for ever. Gen. xvii. 7. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."

Q. 7. Did circumcision constitute any part of this covenant ?

A. No: It was only the sign or token of the covenant. Gen. xvii. 11. "And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you."

Q. 8. Was circumcision a seal of the righteousness of faith ?

A. It was. Rom. iv. 11. "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised."

Q. 9. Did circumcision then ratify, or seal a covenant, in which all the families of the earth were to be blessed?

A. It did. God said to Abram, Gen. xii. 3, "And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

And again, in Gen. xvii. 13. "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

Q. 10. Did the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, change the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant?

A. No. Paul says, in Gal. iii. 17, "That the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."

Q. 11. Did the prophets recognize the continuance of the Abrahamic covenant, after the coming of Christ?

A. They did. 1 Chron. xvi. 15—17. "Be ye mindful always of his covenant; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob, for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant." Here the Abrahamic covenant is recognized to continue for ever.

Q. 12. Was this covenant confirmed of God in Christ?

A. It was. Gal. iii. 16, 17. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."

Q. 13. Are there any other proofs of the confirmation and continuation of the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant in the New Testament?

A. There are: in Luke i. 68—73. "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David: as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to perform the mercies promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he sware to our father Abraham." (See Gen. xxii. 16—18. Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.)

Act iii. 25. "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying, unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed."



Gal. iii. 26—29. // “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

Q. 14. Who were included in the Abrahamic covenant?

A. Abraham and all his seed, and all true believers and their children for ever. Gen. xvii. 7. “And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in all their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.” Gen. xii. 3. “And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” Gal. iii. 29. “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to promise.”

Q. 15. Are believers in Christ, under the New Testament dispensation, recognized as the seed or children of Abraham?

A. They are: Paul says, in Galatians iii. 7, “Know ye, therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.” And in Gal. iii. 29: “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

Q. 16. Did the giving of the law, at Mount Sinai, which is also called a covenant, disannul the covenant of promise made to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before?

A. It did not. Gal. iii. 17. "And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."

Q. 17. How did the covenant, made with Abraham, differ from the covenant made with the house of Israel?

A. That made with Abraham was personal, embracing himself and posterity. See Gen. xii. 1—3. That made with the house of Israel was national. The condition of the first was faith, (Gen xv. 6.) and salvation was the promise. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. xii. 3. To this was also added the promise of Canaan. The condition of the second was the observance of external rights, and the land of Canaan was the promise. Circumcision was required in both covenants.

Q. 18. Did God, by making a covenant with the head of a household, divide families—covenanting with the parents, and leaving out the children?

A. He did not. "The Lord said unto Noah, come thou and all thy house into the Ark." Gen. vii. 1. And to Abraham, he said, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee,

and thy seed after thee in their generations." Gen. xvii. 7. Natural as well as spiritual seed. And Peter says, "The promise is unto you, and to your children." Acts ii. 39. This shows that the Gospel confirms the same covenant that circumcision did; embracing the natural children, as well as believing children.

Q. 19. Did God say, by the mouth of the prophets, that he would make a new covenant, &c.?

A. He did. Jer. xxxi. 31, 32. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." It was not a changing of the nature or spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant.

Q. 20. Was the covenant made with Abraham, an everlasting covenant?

A. It was: Gen. xvii. 7. "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee."

Q. 21. Does not the prophet tell us, what the spirit, or meaning of this renewal, or new covenant shall be?

A. He does: Jer. xxxi. 33. "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in

their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." Here it is evident, that the prophet had reference to the renewing of the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant, in the latter days, or Christian dispensation. It should also be remarked, that the Jews, at that time, had lost, in a great measure, the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant, and were looking almost entirely at the temporal part.

Q. 22. What covenant was the Apostle Paul speaking of, in Hebrews viii. 7, when he says, "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been found for the second."

A. He was speaking of the law given at Mount Sinai, as will appear from the ninth verse of the same chapter. "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord."

Here we see, that it was the covenant that was made after they left Egypt, therefore, it could not have been the Abrahamic covenant, for the Abrahamic covenant was made 430 years before they left the land of Egypt.

Again, in Heb. vii. 11: "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after

the order of Melchisedek, and not be called after the order of Aaron?

Q. 23. Did not the prophets, and even Christ and his Apostles, acknowledge the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant, and consider it an everlasting covenant?

A. They did: Look at what God said to Abraham, Gen. xvii. 1 and 7; "And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect." — "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, in their generations."

And in Jer. xxxi. 33, God says: "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people." The same is repeated by Paul, in Heb. viii. 10. "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."

In Acts iii. 25, it is said, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying, unto Abra

ham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed."

Compare the following Scriptures : 2 Cor. vi. 16. "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell with them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Lev. xxvi. 11, 12. "And I will set my tabernacle among you, and my soul shall not abhor you; and I will walk among you, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." Ezekiel xxxvii. 27. "My tabernacle shall also be with them, yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people." With these Scriptures before us, it must at once appear clear to every mind, that the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant has never been disannulled.

Q. 24. Is the Abrahamic covenant, "*which was confirmed of God in Christ,*" the covenant of grace?

A. It is. Rom. iv. 16. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all."

Gal. iii. 7, 8. "Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith,

preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed."

Rom. xv. 8. "Now I say, that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."

We cannot suppose that Christ was a minister of circumcision, to confirm a promise, which circumcision never sealed. The Abrahamic covenant was the first covenant that circumcision ever sealed; and, as Christ confirmed it, it was therefore, the covenant of grace.

Q. 25. Had God a Church among the Hebrews?

A. He had. Acts vii. 37, 38. "This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he, that was in the Church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us."

Q. 26. Had this Church an existence before Christ came into the world?

A. It had: for it is said, in the Scripture above quoted, that *Moses was in the Church in the wilderness*. The Church, then, had an existence in the days of Moses; and Moses lived 1600 years before Christ's advent.

Q. 27. Was this the gospel Church, or has God had two Churches in the world?

A. It was the gospel Church : for we cannot suppose, that God would be so changeable, as to have different Churches, at different periods. And Paul says, Gal. iii. 7, 8, "Know ye therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Here we see, that it was not only the gospel Church, but the gospel was preached unto Abraham, about 1900 years before Christ.

Q. 28. Was Christ the foundation of the Church, to which the pious Hebrews belonged?

A. He was : Isaiah says, chapter xxviii. 16, "Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, behold, I lay in Zion, for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation." And Paul says, Eph. ii. 19, 20, "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God ; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

The Apostle Peter says, in his first epistle, chap. ii. verse 6, Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious ; and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded." Here, Isaiah says, "A foundation is laid in Sion ;" Paul says, This foundation was the foun-



dation of the apostles and prophets, and that this foundation was Christ." And Peter says, substantially the same.

Q. 29. Was the Church, of which Christ is the chief corner stone, founded on the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant?

A. It was. (1.) There can be but one covenant of grace, and we have already proven, that the Abrahamic covenant is the covenant of grace.

(2.) There cannot be a true spiritual Church, abstract from the covenant of grace; and as God had but one Church, and that, too, built upon the rock Christ, it is evident, that it was founded upon the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant.

Hear what Paul says on this subject, in Rom. iv. 11. "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had, yet being uncircumcised*; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also." Hear, then, we find in the Church among the Hebrews, an inward spiritual grace, and an outward visible sign; for if the outward sign existed without the inward grace, it would have been a nominal Church only. And if they had the inward grace, without the visible sign, it could not have been a visible Church. But when the grace is implanted in the soul, it will produce the visible sign; for James says, chap. ii. 18, "Show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show

thee my faith by my works." And again, he says, "*Faith without works is dead.*" Circumcision and true holiness, is what God required of Abraham in the organization of this Church; for God first taught Abraham true holiness, and then commanded him to be circumcised, and told him that should be a token of the covenant between them, which Paul, in Rom. iv. 11, proves was the "seal of the righteousness of faith." So it was an outward sign of the inward purification of his heart. And, in Rom. iv. 16. Paul says, "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all."

Q. 30. Did God require holiness of heart of the members of the Church among the Hebrews, as well as an observance of the outward ceremonies?

He did. Gen. xvii. 1. "I am the Almighty God, walk before me, and be thou perfect."

Exodus xx. 3, 4. "Thou shalt have no other God's before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth."

Deut. x. 16. "Circumcise, therefore, the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked." And verse 20; "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy

God; him shalt thou serve, and to him shalt thou cleave, and swear by his name."

Deut. xxx. 6. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

Mich. vi. 8. "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Q. 31. Was Abraham to be heir of the world?

A. He was. Rom. iv. 13. "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith."

Q. 32. Why, then, was the law added?

A. Because of transgression. Gal. iii. 19. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a Mediator."

Gal. iii. 21. "Is the law, then, against the promise of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law."

Q. 33. Was the gospel preached to Abraham?

A. It was: Paul says, in Gal. iii. 8, "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify

the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." John viii. 56. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day : and he saw it, and was glad."

Q. 34. Have we any other proof, that the gospel was preached to the Church among the Jews?

A. We have, in 1 Cor. x. 1—4: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ."

Heb. iv. 2. "For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." Heb. xi. 13. "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth."

Q. 35. Does the Abrahamic covenant contain any engagement on God's part to *give eternal life*, which is the chief blessing under the gospel dispensation?

A. It does, Matthew xxii. 31—33. "But, as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye

not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine."

Acts xxiv. 14, 15. "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets; and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust."

John xii. 50. "And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."

Heb. xi. 13—16. "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city."

Q. 36. Did the Abrahamic covenant, or Church among the Hebrews, include infants?

A. It did: See Gen. xvii. 12, 13. "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

Q. 37. How were males of both Jews and Gentiles, recognized as members of the Church?

A. By the circumcision of the flesh. Circumcision was the ceremony by which they were recognized as members of the Church, and ratified their covenant relationship to God and his Church. It also bound its subjects to an observance of the whole law. Paul says, "For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is debtor to do the whole law." Gal. v. 3.

The Jews visible relation to the visible Church was ratified by visible circumcision. This circumcision did not bring its subjects into spiritual relation to God. "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Rom. ii. 28, 29. The circumcision, then, of the flesh,

was only the outward "SIGN," or "SEAL of the righteousness of faith," or the circumcision of the heart in the spirit. This spiritual circumcision, then, initiates its subjects into a spiritual relation to God.

Deut. x. 16. "Circumcise, therefore, the foreskin of your hearts, and be no more stiff-necked."

Deut. xxx. 6. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul." The same may be said of water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Q. 38. Was circumcision a religious rite?

A. It was; for the following reasons:—

(1.) Because it was not peculiarly a national rite.

(2.) It did not belong to the ceremonial law; for Abraham was circumcised 430 years before the law was given. John vii. 22. "Moses, therefore, gave unto you circumcision, (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers.)"

(3.) It was one of the conditions, or passports, to the passover. Exod. xii. 43, 44, "And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the passover: there shall no stranger eat thereof: but every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof." And, in the 28th verse, "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord,

let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one born in the land; for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof."

This last text holds out the idea, that a stranger might dwell among the Jews without being circumcised; but was not allowed to partake of the passover until he was circumcised. If we admit that the paschal lamb prefigured Christ, and that the passover was a religious rite, and that no stranger was allowed to partake of it, without first being circumcised: we must admit, that circumcision was a religious rite.

Under the Christian dispensation, we have the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in room of the passover, as may be seen by consulting 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore, let us keep the feast," &c. And all admit, that we must be baptized, before we are allowed to partake of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, if we put the bread and wine in the place of the paschal lamb, we must, to be consistent, place baptism in the room of circumcision; and, consequently, if we admit, which all admit, that baptism is a religious rite, or ordinance, we must, also, of necessity, admit circumcision to be a religious rite. We will let St. Paul decide the question, Rom. iv. 11. "And he," (Abraham) "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be



the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also."

Q. 39. Did the Abrahamic covenant, or Church among the Hebrews, include infants, not only of the Jewish nation, but also of other nations, on the faith of their parents?

A. It did: Gen. xvii. 12, 13, "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."

• Exodus xii. 48, 49. "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the pass-over unto the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one born in the land: for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. One law shall be to him that is home-born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth with you."

Here we see that the Church includes infants, and that strangers, Gentiles or heathens, were allowed the privilege of renouncing their idolatry, and of becoming members of the Church among the Jews. But they could not enjoy its communion, or passover, until they acknowledged the authority of God by circumcising their children.

Q. 40. Have we any Scripture evidence that the Church was the same under the Jewish and Christian dispensations ?

A. We have: Jer. xi. 16, "The Lord called thy name, a green olive tree, fair, and of goodly fruit: with the noise of a great tumult he hath kindled a fire upon it, and the branches of it are broken."

The prophet here calls the Church, a *green olive* tree, and says, that "the branches were broken off," and Paul tells us why they were broken off: "Because of unbelief." But did this breaking off of some of the branches injure the root, or invalidate the spirituality of the Abrahamic covenant ? We will let Paul answer this question, Rom. xi. 17, "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree," &c. Verse 24, "For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature, into a good olive tree, how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?"

Is not this proof, as strong as any one could desire ?

Again : Gal. iii. 29, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Rom. iv. 16. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the

promise might be sure to all the seed : not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all."

Again, the parable of the husbandman and vineyard, is also proof to the point. Matt. xxi. 33, 34, "Hear another parable; There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country; and when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it." The householder here spoken of, is God; the vineyard, is the Church. The husbandmen are the Jews, and the servants the prophets. Verses 35, 36, "And the husbandmen (*the Jews,*) took his servants, (*the prophets,*) and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. And again, he sent other servants more than the first, and they did unto them likewise." Verse 37, "But last of all, he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son." Verse 39, "And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him."

Now, what did the Lord of the vineyard say he would do, when he heard of the wicked acts of the husbandmen, (*the Jews,*) to whom he first let the vineyard? Did he say he would break down the vineyard, and plant a new one? No.

Verse 41. They say, "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, (*the Jews,*) and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their season." Verse 43, "Therefore, say I unto you, (*Jews*) the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation, (*the believing Gentiles,*) bringing forth the fruits thereof." Here it appears, that the kingdom of God, which the Jews once possessed, and in which the ancient prophets once exercised their ministry, one after another, is now in the possession of the Gentiles.

Q. 41. As circumcision was the token, or seal, of the Abrahamic covenant; what seal have we, under the gospel dispensation, in place of circumcision?

A. Baptism.

Q. 42. When a positive institute, or rite, is connected with a promise, do not all who are embraced in that promise, have a right to the institute?

A. They do.

Q. 43. Who were included in the promise made to Abraham?

A. Adults and infants.

Q. 44. Who, then, had a right to the positive institute, or circumcision?

A. Those to whom the promise was made.

Q. 45. Who, then, have a right to be baptized?

A. Those to whom the promise is made.

Q. 46. Who, then, are included in the promise?

A. Peter says, in Acts ii. 39, "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

And again, in Acts iii. 25, he says, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed."

What proof can be more direct for infant baptism? From these Scriptures, the conclusion is plainly this: That infants, in the New Testament, stand in the same relation to baptism, that they did, in the Old Testament, to circumcision; consequently, their right to the one, must be the same as it was to the other.

Q. 47. If infants were included in the Abrahamic covenant, or covenant of grace, and are fit subjects to receive the ordinance of baptism, why was there not an express command to baptize them?

A. (1.) It was unnecessary to give such a command, for infants were always included in that covenant. Previous to the death of Christ, circumcision was the seal, or outward sign, of the covenant; and as it was a bloody rite, it had reference to their faith in the Messiah, who was to come, and shed his blood for the sin of the world.

(2.) It was unnecessary, because we have not in the OLD OR NEW TESTAMENT, "Thus saith the Lord," infants shall be excluded from the Church.

(3.) It was unnecessary, from the fact, that the early Christians were fully convinced of the identity of the Church, under the new dispensation, with that of the old; consequently, a new warrant for the inclusion of their infant seed, in the covenanted family, was unnecessary.

(4.) In the next place, the Apostles understood Christ, as saying, or implying, that infants should be baptized: when he said unto them, Matthew xxviii. 19, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." A nation includes men, women, and children; and, from the days of Abraham to Christ, children were objects of special attention in their instructions, or teachings: as we see in the Old Testament. And as the NEW TESTAMENT is a supplement to the OLD, and as teaching of the children is repeatedly enjoined in the New Testament, they were certainly not mistaken. As teaching and baptizing were united in the commission, they certainly could not have understood Christ as meaning any thing else than that they should baptize as well as teach children.

And Peter certainly understood the command as embracing infants, when, on the day of Pentecost, the Apostles were filled with the Holy

Ghost, he said to the awakened and inquiring multitude, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children," &c. Acts. ii. 38, 39.

Paul certainly understood the command, as well as the covenant, to include infants, as did also Peter, and all the other Apostles. Gal. iii. 29, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Q. 48. Did the Abrahamic covenant include infants of the Gentiles before the coming of Christ, as well as infants of the Jews?

A. It did. Exod. xii. 48, "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one born in the land."

Q. 49. What is said, in the New Testament, to the Gentiles, respecting the blessings of Abraham?

A. Romans xi. 17. "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree," &c.

Gal. iii. 13, 14, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth



upon a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit, through faith." The Gentiles had, under the Jewish dispensation, been allowed the privilege, not only of uniting with the Church, but also of bringing their children with them. And, further, parents were not allowed to participate in the ordinances of the Church, until they had their children recognized as members. If they had been denied this privilege, by the Apostles, they could not have been the recipients of the blessings of Abraham. The Galatians, certainly, understood Paul, when he said, "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles," that they were allowed the privilege of having their children with them in the Church.

Q. 50. Are there any texts in the OLD or NEW TESTAMENT, disannulling the right of infants to Church membership?

A. There are none.

Q. 51. Are there any passages, in the NEW TESTAMENT, favoring the Church membership of infants?

A. There are; Matt. xix. 13—15: "Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hand on them, and departed thence."



Acts ii. 39; "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

1 Cor. vii. 14; "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." Not positively, or personally holy; but holy in consequence of the believing parent, that is, having a right, thereby, to receive the ordinance of baptism, by which their relation to the Church was recognized or sealed, which could not be done, unless one, or both the parents, were believers.

Gentiles, in the Scripture, were denominated common or unclean; while those who were consecrated to God were called holy. Therefore, the infant of the believing parent was called holy, because it was entitled to the ordinance of baptism, by which its Church relation, as a member in a state of minority, was recognized.

This was assigned as a reason, why the believing parent should not leave his, or her unbelieving companion.

Q. 52. Was it not the custom of the Apostles to receive and baptize whole families on the faith of the head of the household?

A. It was; Acts xvi. 14, 15: "And a certain woman, named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of

Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there." And when the Philippian jailor said, (Acts xvi. 30,) "Sirs, what must I do to be saved," Paul's answer was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house," or family. Verse 33; "And he took them, the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway."

And Paul says, 1 Cor. i. 16, "And I baptized also the house of Stephanas."

It is not certain, but very probable, that there were infants in some, or all of these families. But one thing is certain, the grand principle of household, or family baptism, is established: or the principle of receiving all the younger members of the household on the faith of their parents.

Q. 53. Was Christ the head of the Church?

A. He was.

Q. 54. If infants were not allowed Church membership, when did Christ become a member of his own Church?

A. Never.

Q. 55. If the following facts are established, which have already been done by the immutable word of God, that infants were included in the Abrahamic covenant—that all the families of the earth were to be blessed in him—and that the Church was founded upon the spirituality of the

Abrahamic covenant, should not infants now be recognized as members of the Church, by the administration of baptism?

A. They should.

Q. 56. Did the introduction of the gospel, or Christian dispensation, change the nature of the Abrahamic covenant?

A. It did not.

Q. 57. If only some of the natural branches of the tame olive tree, or Jewish members, were broken off, in consequence of unbelief, were there not infant Church members, when the Gentiles were grafted in, among the natural branches?

A. There certainly were.

Q. 58. What are we to understand by some of the branches being broken off, as stated by Paul, in Romans xi. 17.

A. That the Church was purified, and its spirituality restored.

Q. 59. Did the bringing in of the Gentiles constitute a new Church?

A. It did not: Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, who were Gentiles, shows, conclusively, that by Christ's interposition, the Jews and Gentiles were united in Church privileges, so as to enjoy the unity of the Church as one. Hear what he says, in Ephesians ii. 14; "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us." And, in Col. ii. 14; "Blotting out the hand writing of ordinances that was against us, which

was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross."

Q. 60. But, in Daniel ii. 44, it is said, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed." This certainly alludes to the gospel dispensation, and looks very much like establishing a *new Church* in the world.

A. By "*setting up* a kingdom," we are not to understand, creating a new kingdom, but **ESTABLISHING** one already in existence. In Luke i. 32, 33, it is said, by the angel, who came to announce the conception of Christ, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever." Now, we know, that the throne, or kingdom of David, in a temporal sense, was destroyed, or ceased; but the angel says, "*He shall have the throne of his father David.*" It must, therefore, be understood, as relating to a spiritual kingdom, or the Church. See Acts xv. 15, 16. "And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." This quotation is made by the Apostle James, from the prophet Amos ix. 11. Thus we see, how perfectly the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments harmonize in this one truth,

that the Church is the same under the old and new dispensations; its blessings equally extend to the believer and his offspring under the new, as under the old dispensation.

Q. 61. If infants were denied Church membership under the Christian dispensation, what would the Jews say, when they returned to be grafted into their own olive tree, from which the Gentiles had been drawing spiritual nourishment?

A. They would say, You have changed the "covenant made with Abraham, which covenant was confirmed of God in Christ."

Q. 62. Have we any positive command, in the New Testament, for females partaking of the Lord's Supper?

A. We have not.

Q. 63. How, then, do our Baptist brethren, as well as those of other denominations, prove, that females have a right to partake of the Sacrament?

A. By reference to the Old Testament, especially to those passages which relate to females partaking of the paschal lamb, and then putting the Sacrament in the place of the pass-over, and connecting therewith, the presumptive evidence of the New Testament.

Q. 64. Are we not justifiable, then, in pursuing the same course, to prove the Church membership of infants, and of placing baptism in the room of circumcision, and also of proving that sprinkling is the Scripture baptism?

A. We are.

Q. 65. If infant baptism was not taught, or practiced by Christ and his Apostles, did not the Church fall into an egregious error, and that, too, at a very early period?

A. She did.

Q. 66. What does Dr. Wall say, on this subject, in his History of Baptism?

A. He says: "For the first 400 years after Christ, there appears only one man, Tertullian, who advises the delay of infant baptism in some cases, and one Gregory, who did, perhaps, practice such delay, in the case of his own children; but no society, of men so thinking, or so practicing, nor any individual, say, it was unlawful to baptize infants. So, in the next 700 years, there is not so much as one man to be found, who either spoke for, or practiced such delay; but all to the contrary. And when about the year 1130, one sect among the Waldenses, or Albigences, declared against the baptism of infants, as incapable of salvation, the main body of the people rejected their opinion; and they who held that opinion quickly dwindled away, and disappeared; there being nothing more heard of any holding that tenet, until the rising of the German Anabaptists, in the year 1522."

Q. 67. What does Dr. Miller say, on the same subject?

A. Dr. Miller says: "For 1500 years after Christ, the practice of infant baptism was univer-

sal. That, from the time of the Apostles, to the time of Luther, the general, unopposed, established practice of the Church was, to regard the infant seed of believers as members of the Church, and, as such, to baptize them."

Q. 68. The Baptists say, the baptism of infants is an innovation, and one of the corruptions of Popery. Can they point out, in history, when this *corrupt practice*, as they call it, was introduced into the Church?

A. They cannot. Mr. Robinson, one of their most learned, and far-famed writers of the history of baptism, says: "*It is impossible to say any thing certain, by what means, or at what moment, infant baptism found its way into the Catholic Church.*"

This would be a strange phenomena, *if true*, that an error of such magnitude, as Baptists hold the baptism of infants to be, should find its way into the Church, and become a universal practice, and not the least trace of its introduction to be found.

Q. 69. Does not history show when the ARIAN HERESY COMMENCED, also THE PELAGIAN HERESY; and when image worship was introduced into the Church, and a great many controversies on minor points in Theology?

A. It does.

Q. 70. Is it reasonable, then, to suppose, that the baptizing of infants could have been introduced into the Church subsequent to the days



of Christ and his Apostles, and have become a universal practice, without some opposition, or controversy, to indicate the time of its introduction?

A. It is not reasonable.

Q. 71. What is the testimony of the early Christian fathers upon this subject?

A. Ireneus, who wrote about fifty years after the Apostles, and was a disciple of Polycarp, one of John's disciples, and also saw and conversed with those, who had seen our Lord in the flesh, mentions "*the baptism of infants, as no matter of dispute in his day.*"

Justin Martyr, who was born about thirty years after the death of Christ, speaks of baptism being to us in the room of circumcision.

Origen, a Greek father, of the third century, and decidedly the most learned man in his day, says: "According to the usage of the Church, baptism is given even to infants." Again, he says: "For this cause it was, that the Church received an order from the Apostles, to give baptism even to infants."

Cyprian, a Latin father, of the third century, and contemporary with Origen, in council, with sixty-six Bishops, held at Carthage, in 253, decided that infants might be baptized at any time, without waiting till they were eight days old, as in the case of circumcision. They did not decide that infants should be baptized. This no man denied, it being the universal custom of



the Church at this early period. The only question was, whether their baptism must be deferred till they were eight days old, or whether it might be administered earlier.

Pelagius, who lived a little more than three hundred years after the Apostles, and was one of the most learned men of his day, having travelled over nearly every part of the Christian world, though a heretic in regard to human depravity, says: "*I never heard of any, not even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants.*"

Augustin, the learned, talented, and venerable opposer of the Pelagian heresy, who lived at the same time with Pelagius, in his controversy with them, says: "*Since they grant that infants must be baptized, as not being able to resist the authority of the whole Church, which was doubtless delivered by our Lord and his Apostles.*"









